

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed December 14, 2004, Claims 1-30 are currently pending in the above referenced application. Claims 1-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In addition, claims 6 and 19 are objected to, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 1-3, 20-21, 23-24, and 26-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Burgess et al., (U.S. Patent No. 5,758,071). Claims 4, and 7-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Burgess et al., (U.S. Patent No. 5,758,071). Finally, Claims 5, 22, and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Burgess et al., (U.S. Patent No. 5,758,071) in view of Shuster, (U.S. Patent No. 6,763,379).

Various alleged informalities in Claims 1-30 have been modified. Specifically, Applicants have withdrawn the objected to language directed to the phrase "may be." In addition, Claims 4, 5, and 6 have been cancelled without prejudice. Independent Claims 1, 20, 24, 27, and 28 have been rewritten to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, including dependent claim 6 which is allowable.

In view of the remarks above, Applicants' respectfully submit that the present application, including Claims 1-3, and 7-30 is in condition for allowance and solicits action to that end. If there are any additional matters that may be resolved or clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Applicant's undersigned
5 representative.

Respectfully submitted,

McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff LLP

10 Date: March 22, 2005

By: 

Thomas E. Wettermann
Reg. No. 41,523